



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/589,427	06/07/2000	Yechiam Yemini	19240-229	1117

28089 7590 02/11/2005

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP
399 PARK AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER

REVAK, CHRISTOPHER A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/589,427

Applicant(s)

YEMINI ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher A. Revak

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>see attached</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.
2. The examiner notes that the applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., electronic security value unit is a form of currency or used for payment) is not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The applicant has claimed the "electronic security value unit", but it is argued that the "electronic security value unit" consists of multiple embodiments as that of a form of currency and/or is used for payment which is not claimed. The examiner is broadly interpreting the claim language of "electronic security value unit" as that of retaining any identifying information, if the applicant wishes to have the "electronic security value unit" limited to currency or a form of payment, the claims will need to be amended accordingly.
3. The applicant has overcome the objection to claims 1 and 3 and the objection is hereby withdrawn.

Drawings

4. The examiner acknowledges the applicant's drawing changes, however, the applicant has failed to submit the drawings on a replacement sheet that is labeled

"Replacement Sheet" in the header. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). Failure to timely submit the "Replacement Sheet" will result in the abandonment of the application.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on October 28, 2004 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is considering the information disclosure statement.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Win et al, U.S. Patent 6,182,142. The examiner notes that the teachings of Win et al refer to both a cookie and a token which are both interpreted as that of an "electronic security value unit" as is claimed by the applicant.

As per claim 1, it is disclosed by Win et al of a method for identifying a client (particular component) of an electronic system that accessed a resource of said electronic system (col. 1, lines 5-10 and col. 2, lines 35-40). A token (electronic security

Art Unit: 2131

value unit) is created and distributed to the client (component)(col. 2, lines 28-40). A first association is created between the client (component) and the cookie (electronic security value unit) that lists the user's roles (col. 6, lines 52-59). The cookie (electronic security value unit) is provided from the web browser, located at the client (component) to a protected web server (resource manager) in exchange for access to the resource (col. 6, lines 59-61 and col. 6, line 65 through col. 7, line 3). The cookie/token (electronic security value unit) also includes a second association with the resources wherein by analyzing the second association determines a list of customized information that includes the user's name and role in regards to accessing the requested resources (col. 3, lines 21-31 and col. 7, lines 1-5). The first association determines (by analyzing) the client (component) accessed the resource that includes information date and time information (col. 7, lines 3-5 and col. 10, lines 34-38).

As per claim 2, it is disclosed by Win et al that the client (component) is a functional group of an organization that uses client computers (components) and the resource is a subset (group) of resources (col. 3, lines 22-23, col. 5, lines 13-18,40-45).

As per claim 3, it is taught by Win et al the cookie (electronic security value unit) is distributed to the client (component) upon a request of the client (component) for access to the resource (col. 6, lines 52-61).

As per claim 4, Win et al teaches of distributing the token (electronic security value unit) from a protected server (first electronic bank) server associated with the resource to an access server (second electronic bank) server associated with the client (component)(col. 2, lines 28-40,50-56). The protected server (first electronic bank)

server creates and records a first part of the first association that indicates the distribution of the cookie (electronic security value unit) to the access server (second electronic bank) server (col. 2, lines 28-40, 62-65 and col. 6, line 65 through col. 7, line 5). The access server (second electronic bank) server creates and records a second part of the first association that indicates the distribution of the token (electronic security value unit) to the client (component) (col. 2, lines 28-40, 62-65 and col. 10, lines 56-67).

As per claim 5, Win et al discloses of creating a second association that distributes the token (electronic security value unit) from the access server (second electronic bank server) to the client (component) wherein the client (component) creates and records the second association (col. 2, lines 50-55, col. 3, lines 21-31, col. 6, lines 52-56, and col. 7, lines 1-5).

As per claims 6 and 7, Win et al teaches of encrypting the cookie (electronic security value unit) that includes a first association between the client (component) and the cookie (electronic security value unit) that lists the user's roles and a second association with the resources wherein by analyzing the second association determines a list of customized information that includes the user's name and role in regards to accessing the requested resources (col. 3, lines 21-31, col. 6, lines 52-59, col. 7, lines 1-5, and col. 11, lines 1-2). Win et al discloses of encrypting the cookies (electronic security value units) wherein it is disclosed by the examiner that encryption protects against unauthorized access, tampering, and duplication by requiring a proper key that is used to encrypt and decrypt content that is held by the authorized user to gain access to the protected, encrypted content as is known by one of skill in the art.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lee, U.S. Patent 6,816,871 discloses of a cookie containing identifying and authentication information about a client requesting access to resources.

Lee, U.S. Patent 6,782,379 discloses of a cookie containing identifying and authentication information about a client requesting access to resources.

Shandony, U.S. Patent 6,675,261 discloses of a cookie containing identifying and authentication information about a client requesting access to resources.

Davis et al, U.S. Patent 6,643,696 discloses of a cookie containing identifying information about a client requesting access to resources.

Sampson, U.S. Patent 6,490,624 discloses of encrypting cookies that contain information to verify that a user is authorized to access resources.

Markus, U.S. Patent 6,490,601 discloses of a cookie containing identifying information about a client requesting access to resources.

Masters, U.S. Patent 6,473,802 discloses of a cookie that includes information that a resource is accessible at a destination and that the destination was previously selected to provide access to the requested resource.

Masters, U.S. Patent 6,374,300 discloses of a cookie that includes information that a resource is accessible at a destination and that the destination was previously selected to provide access to the requested resource.

Sampson, U.S. Patent 6,339,423 discloses of multi-domain access control wherein access control cookies prove that users are authorized to access resources.

Win et al, U.S. Patent 6,161,139 discloses of cookies that are used to verify that a user is authorized to access resources.

Fortinsky, U.S. Patent 5,815,574 discloses of sending a privilege attribute certificate from a client to a server and the client provides information about the client's identity and privileges that they are granted.

Carlson et al, U.S. Patent 5,506,961 discloses of a client providing a token to a server in order to obtain requested information.

Carlson et al, U.S. Patent 5,542,046 discloses of a client providing a token to a server in order to obtain requested information.

Kohl et al, "The Kerberos Network Authentication Service" discloses of the Kerberos protocol.

Neuman et al, "Kerberos : An Authentication Service for Computer Networks" discloses of the Kerberos protocol.

Gittler et al, "The DCE Security Service" discloses of providing secure transmissions between transacting parties.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher A. Revak whose telephone number is 571-272-3794. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2131


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CR


February 6, 2005

Christopher Revak

AU 2131


2/6/05